

### Interview Summary

Application No.

10/586,341

Applicant(s)

HAYASHI ET AL.

Examiner

Cathy Lam

Art Unit

1794

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Cathy Lam

(3) \_\_\_\_\_

(2) Atty. Takashi Saito

(4) \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Interview: 26 May 2009Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conferencec) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant2) ☒ applicant's representative]Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.

If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_

Claim(s) discussed: 3Identification of prior art discussed: N/AAgreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: in line 2 of claim 3, the phrase "first the recessed portions" appears to be an error. The examiner suggested to change the phrase to -- the first recessed portions --.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Cathy Lam/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1794